



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

Barry H. Carl

Class

C414

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

Barry H. Carl

Class

C414

"CENA AND PRANDIUM IN PLAUTUS."

Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at the University of California.

Barry H. Cerf.



Berkeley. 1903.

2

We must be slow to apply to the private life of Plautus's time conclusions reached after a study of the plays. Although the relation of the Roman poet to his Greek originals is still an open question, yet no one can doubt but that Plautus often made use of some interesting conditions existing among the Greeks and not among the Romans. Sometimes he expressly states that the scene he is describing is Greek, not Roman. For instance; the very interesting ending of Stichus in which the slaves feast and dance is, the poet warns us, Greek not Roman;

" Atque id ne vos miremini, hominis servolos

Potare, amare atque ad cenam condicere:

Licet haec Athenis nobis."

446 ff¹⁾

Therefore we cannot be sure that, in the matter of meals, what seems true as regards the plays is also true in regard to the Roman life of Plautus's time. Whatever may have been the number and nature of the terms for the various meals, used by the poets of the Greek New Comedy, we find that Plautus employs a very limited vocabulary for the expression of these ideas. Ientaculum, the ordinary word for the first meal of the day in later times does not occur in Plautus. But in Curculio 72, 3 the readings of the MSS. were emended thus by Skutsch:

72 Me inferre Veneri vovi iam¹⁾ ientaculum.

¹⁾ The numbering and the text throughout this paper are from the Teubner edition of Plautus (ed. Goetz-Schoell).

73 Quid antepones Veneri ~~(la)ien~~-taculo?

Phaedromus (adulescens) and Palinurus(servos) are speaking before the house of Planesium, whom the young man loves. The sun has not yet risen and the speakers are carrying torches (9, 182). The ientaculum in this case seems hardly to be a meal but when Palinurus asks (90):

"Vultisne olivas, pulpamentum, capparim?"

we may suppose that he is naming the foods which ordinarily composed the ientaculum. If so it was very light and if we may judge from this passage was eaten very early in the morning. The wine which was poured on the door (88 ff) may also have been considered a part of this meal. The corruptions of the MSS. in Truculentus 597 may possibly cover ientaculum;

"Usque adiectaculem iussit."

The word does not occur in Terence.

It must be remembered that the plays of Plautus afford few opportunities for the introduction of this meal.

Vesper in Plautus, in the phrases in vesperum and de vesperi is taken to refer to an evening meal. The former phrase occurs twice:

"Ego ire in Piraeum volo

In vesperum parare piscatum mihi."

Most. 66, 7.

"Res paratast mala in vesperum huic seni

Nam et cenandum et cubandumst ei male."

Most. 700, 1.

But certainly in neither case is it necessary to refer the phrase to an evening meal. In the former case Tranio is going to get some

fish for use at evening. In the latter case there is a storm in preparation for Simo's evening. In vesperum does not seem to differ from ad vesperum which occurs frequently in Plautus (e. g. Amph. 253, Merc., 580, Miles 503, cf. Ter. Hecyra 442). and always referring to time of day. But the phrase de vesperi (note the form of the ablative) which occurs twice in Plautus, never in Terence, seems to refer to an evening meal. This is clearly shown from Rudens 181 ff:

"Si tu de illarum cenaturus vesperi's

Illis curandum censeo, Sceparnio:

Si apud me essuru's, mihi dari operam volo."

"Qui de vesperi vivat suo" (Miles 995) seems to mean "who is a man of independent means."

The word merenda occurs in Most. 966 and Vid. 52:

"Vide sis, ne forte ad merendam quopiam devorteris

Atque ibi amplius quam satis fuerit biberis." Most. 966,7.

We get the time of day from 651: "iam adpetit meridies." The action of the play seems continuous. At 691 Simo comes out of his house just after having finished his prandium. So merenda in 966 seems to refer to a midday meal, or at any rate to one eaten about the same time as the prandium.

The word occurs again in Vid. 52: Nicodemus (adolescens) is offering his services to Dinia (senex) and praising himself as one

"Cibique minumi maxumaeque industria. 42.

51 Ni. Nec mihi nisi unum prandium quicquam duis

Praeter mercedem. Di. Quid merendam? Ni. Ne duis,

Neque cenam. Di. Non cenabis? Ni. Immo ibo domum."

5

Here prandium, merenda and cena are apparently differentiated.

We notice a strange disagreement between the remarks of Paul.-Fest. in regard to the meals of the "antiqui" and the usage of the various terms in the extant plays of Plautus. Three meals which at a later period were called ientaculum, prandium and cena were according to Paul.-Fest. known to the "antiqui" as prandiculum, cena, and merenda or vespera.

"Prandicula antiqui dicebant quae nunc ientacula." 250, 8 M.

"Coena apud antiquos dicebatur, quod nunc est prandium: vesperna quam nunc coenam appellamus." 54, 4 M.

cf. 339, 14 M.: "scensas Sabini dicebant quae nunc cenas. Quae autem nunc prandia, cenas habebant et pro cenis vespervas antiqui." cf. 338, 4 M.

"Prandium ex Graeco $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ est dictum, nam meridianum cibum coenam vocabant." 223, 5 M.

"Merendam antiqui dicebant pro prandio, quod scilicet medio die caperetur." 123, 23 M.

"Vesperna apud Plautum coena intelligitur." 368, 8 M. (cf. 54, 4 quoted above)

The first statement, that the "antiqui" used the word prandiculum for ientaculum is not true of Plautus so far as the extant plays offer any evidence. For prandiculum does not occur and ientaculum does appear twice by two slight emendations. (see above where Cist. 72, 3 are quoted. The word may also be hidden by corruptions in the passage of Truculentus also quoted above.) Vesperna which is said to have been used to denote the cena of later times does not occur in Plautus. (Vesper in the phrases de vesperi and in vesperum is discussed above.)

Merenda occurs, as we have seen above, twice in Plautus. In agreement with the remarks of Paul.- Fest. it is used in Most. for a noon meal. But in Plautus prandium is not always a noon meal nor is cena always an evening meal as the statements in Paul. - Fest. lead us to expect.

Before discussing the time implied by the terms cena and prandium let us consider their character. It will be found that the meals may be equally elaborate as regards preparation, number of guests and the hiring of cooks.

In Cistellaria, Gymnasium and her mother (Syra?) were well entertained at a prandium by Selenium. Gymnasium says:

"Ita in prandio nos lepide ac nitide

Accepisti apud te, ut semper meminerimus."

10, 11.

There seems to have been plenty to drink. Syra is "saburrata" (121) and so "multiloqua et multibiba" (149), yet she complains that the servant did not fill the cups fast enough (19). The prandium in Menaechmi is one of the most elaborate meals in Plautus. Menaechmus and the parasite Ergasilus go to the house of the courtesan Erotium and order her to prepare the meal. Menaechmus says to Ergasilus (173 ff):

"Nunc ad amicam deferetur (the "palla") hanc meretricem Erotium.

Mihi, tibi atque illi iubebo iam adparari prandium -----

Inde usque ad diurnam stellam crastinam potabimus."

(The last word is Ritschl's emendation for poterimus.)

A little later talking to Erotium he says (208 ff.):

"Iube igitur tribus nobis apud te prandium accurarier,
Atque aliquid scitamentorum de foro opsonarier:
Glandionidam, suillam, laridum, pernonidam
Aut sincipitamenta porcina aut aliquid ad eum modum
Madida quae mihi adposita in mensam milvinam suggerant."

We have many examples of elaborate cenae. In fact we may infer from Miles 751 ff. that this meal was usually "magno sumptu": Periplectomenus has invited Pleusicles to a cena and the latter has begged his host to make the meal a slight one. Periplectomenus answers:

"Quin tu istancē orationem hinc veterem atque antiquam amoves?
Proletario sermone nunc quidem, hospes, utere.
Nam i solent, quando accubuere, ubi cena adpositast, dicere:
'Quid opus fuit hoc sumptu tanto nostra gratia?
Insanivisti hercle: nam idem hoc hominibus sat erat decem.'"

To cook the cena nuptialis in the Aulularia Strobilus, the slave has gone to the forum to hire a chief cook and his assistants. (280 ff.) The cenae of Casina, (see 720 ff. where Olympio returns from the forum with his pompa of cooks and slaves carrying provisions), Mercator, Stichus (see end) and many other plays are elaborate. Lysimachus says in Merc. 694, 5:

"Decem si ad cenam vocasset summos viros,
Nimium obsomavit."

As regards cooks, we have already seen that they are hired to prepare the cenae of Casina and Aulularia. Cooks are employed for the prandium also. In Curc. 251 ff. the cook says to Palinurus the slave:

"Palinure, quid stas? quin depromuntur mihi

Quae opus sunt, parasito ut sit paratum prandium,

Quom veniat?"

Compare also Men. 219 ff. where Erotium orders Cylindrus, the cook to go to the market and get provisions to be prepared for the prandium ordered a few lines before.

For guests at the prandium see Cist. 10, Men. 174, 5, Poen. 469, Miles 712; at the cena: Merc. 97 ff., Most. 485 ff., Truc. 127. We have numerous examples of cenae adventiciae: Bacch. 94, 185, 536; Curc. 660 (the meal here is to be given by the person arriving), Epid. 7, Most. 1004, Poen. 1151, Truc. 127. But prandium is also used in this sense: Amph. 665, Curc. 251. So it is evident that the terms prandium and cena do not indicate meals of different character.

To return to the statements in Paul. - Fest. There it is asserted that the prandium of later times was called cena by the "antiqui". This statement is not applicable to Amphitruo. An analysis of the play will show that the prandium of 665 is a forenoon meal, probably the earliest of the day. Day breaks at 5.50 where Jupiter and Mercury leave the stage. (see 543 where Mercury says: "Lucescit hoc iam.") Before this time Sosia has returned from the war leaving his master at the port, has been confronted by his counterpart and at 460 has rushed off to find his master. Just at day break, when the two gods are leaving the stage, Amphitruo and Sosia arrive. There cannot be any intermission here, for certainly Amphitruo had good reason to hurry home and master and slave talk as if they had not been long together. Furthermore there is nothing in the play to indicate an intermission

and we have constant occurrences of dudum, modo etc. which join closely the first two acts. (see 602, 661, 683, 689, 695, 699, 767.)

In 665 Sosia says:

" domi daturus nemost prandium venientibus ."

The time of the action is just after day break. So the meal indicated must have been the first meal of the day, taken very early. In 283 we have cena used of a late afternoon meal. Sosia says:

" Neque ego hac nocte longiorem me vidisse censeo
Nisi item unam, verberatus quam pependi perpetem:

Cerdo edepol equidem dormire solem, atque adpotum probe:

Mira sunt nisi invitavit sese in cena plusculum ."

The cena of 804 is also an evening meal. Other examples could be adduced but these are sufficient to show that the statement in Paul.-Fest. that the "antiqui" used the word cena for the prandium of later times is not applicable to the plays of Plautus. In fact we have in Plautus not a single instance of the use of cena for the noon day meal. (compare Paul.-Fest. 223, 5 M. quoted above.) The cena in Plautus seems always to be the last meal of the day, begun some time in the afternoon. But the poet's use of prandium is not so consistent. We have already seen that this word in Amphitruo indicates the first meal of the day. In Mostellaria the word is used for a noon day meal. In 651 we are given the time: " iam adpetit merides ." At 690 (there is no intermission) Simo comes out of his house and says (692):

"Prandium uxor mihi perbonum dedit."

This meal then took place at or about midday. For a prandium

continuing till evening see Merc. 578-80.

"coquom

Aliquem arripiamus, prandium qui percoquat

Apud te hic usque ad vesperum."

This last prandium was then to be enjoyed "all the way up to night-fall", at a time when the cena was usually eaten as almost any one of the plays will show.

We have seen that prandium and cena do not necessarily indicate meals of a different nature, and that the two words may be used in reference to the same time of day. It appears moreover that the two terms are at times applied by Plautus to one and the same meal,^{2/} In Bacch. 79 Pistoclerus says to Bacchis:

"Quid si apud te eveniat desubito prandium aut potatio
Forte aut cena, ut solet in istis fieri conciliabulis,
Ubi ego tum accumbam?"

If desubito refers to all the means of refreshment^s suggested there is clearly no exact distinction in time and an analysis of the play lends support to this conclusion. In 94 Bacchis makes a counter proposal and suggests a cena adventicia in her sister's honor. Pistoclerus hastens off to secure provisions with which he returns in the next scene (130-131). Lydus, after expostulating in vain, follows Pistoclerus into the house

^{2/} The "whimsicalness" of Plautus and even of later Romans in the use of cena and prandium is briefly referred to by Prof. W. S. Scarborough in Trans. Amer. Phil. Assn. 25, XXXIII.

of Bacchis (189). Chrysalus appears: Pistoclerus comes out of the house addressing Bacchis within. Chrysalus suggests a cena adventicia in his own honor (185-6) and at the end of the scene sends Pistoclerus into Bacchis's house again (227-8). Nicobulus appears in the next scene and learns the failure of his enterprise from Chrysalus: he goes to meet Mnesilochus in 348. Chrysalus leaves the scene at 367. In 368-384 Lydus reappears and reports his experiences in the house of Bacchis: he goes off to tell Philoxenus. Mnesilochus enters at 385, overhears Lydus and Philoxenus, misinterprets their words, convicts Pistoclerus of bad faith. Pistoclerus comes out of Bacchis's house in 526 and promises to look up Mnesilochus: the latter appears opportunely, and Mnesilochus discovers his error of judgment. The two enter the house of Bacchis (572). In 536 ff. Pistoclerus had offered a cena adventicia which Mnesilochus had indignantly refused. Pistoclerus is called out of the house, disputes with the parasite of the miles and sends him off. Mnesilochus appears from the house and the two discuss Mnesilochus' perplexity, from which Chrysalus who appears at 640, plans to relieve them. In 714 Chrysalus sends Pistoclerus into Bacchis' house for writing materials. Mnesilochus asks what Chrysalus's plan is. Chrysalus begins his explanation with the statement (714) "coctumst prandium". There is no indication of time in the play except at the very end (1205): one of the sisters says: "Vesper hic est". The same meal was in progress then. At 109 Pistoclerus returns with provisions for a cena (94 ff.). This meal has been in course of preparation in Bacchis's house and Chrysalus with the words ~~of~~ "coctumst prandium", announces that it is ready. We may wonder that Chrysalus knows about the meal since he has not been to

that preparations for one have been made. But at any rate the meal which in former scenes has been called a cena is here called a prandium.

An analysis of Casina will, I think show another instance of the use of these terms to designate the same time, though they do not refer to the same meal. Casina is loved by both Lysidamus the husband of her mistress Cleostrata and by Euthynicus, the son. Lysidamus wishes to have the girl married to Olympio the bailiff of his farm in order to get her into his possession. Cleostrata discovers this and so desires to marry Casina to Chalinus her son's armor-bearer as a means of putting the girl in the hands of Euthynicus. The play opens with a heated argument between Olympio and Chalinus. After they leave the scene Cleostrata and her maid Pardalisca appear. Cleostrata orders the store-rooms to be closed and the key to be brought to her at her neighbor's house. "But", objects Pardalisca.

"Prandium iusserat senex sibi parari." 147

Cleostrata answers:

"Neque paro neque hodie coquetur." 149

The door of the neighboring house opens and Myrrhina comes out. Cleostrata greets her and finally tells all her troubles. Myrrhina advises her friend to allow her husband to do what he pleases and to beware of the order "ei foras mulier" (211). At this moment Lysidamus approaches and Cleostrata sends Myrrhina in. She herself remains and overhears her husband while he discusses the pleasures and sorrows of love and declares that he loves Casina (225). He sees his wife and addresses her. After a quarrel the two agree to try to settle the matter by persuading one of —

the slaves to give up Casina. Cleostrata attempts to bribe Olympio and Lysidamus, Chalinus. But the slaves hold out. Finally all agree to decide the matter by lot. Olympio and Lysidamus are successful (416): Lysidamus orders Cleostrata to prepare the "nuptiae" (419). All enter the house except Chalinus who remains outside to bemoan his fate. Lysidamus and Olympio come out of the house and Chalinus steps aside to overhear them. After settling the disposal of Casina, Lysidamus sends Olympio away to get provisions for the wedding feast. (490 ff.). In the next scenes Lysidamus persuades Alcesimus his neighbor, husband of Myrrhina to allow Casina to remain in his (Alcesimus's) house that night. Myrrhina is to be invited to stay all night with Cleostrata (481 ff.). But Cleostrata has been told by Chalinus the reason for this and does not invite her friend. Lysidamus and Alcesimus quarrel on this account: Pardalisca comes out of the house and announces that Casina has gone crazy and is threatening the lives of all concerned in her marriage. At 718 Olympio returns with cooks and provisions and immediately sets them to work on the marriage cena (743, 747, 766, 781). Now at the opening of the play we have seen that Cleostrata refuses to prepare a prandium. A few moments later Olympio is sent away to get provisions for a cana. These terms are not used to designate the same meal but the meals do not seem to differ in time. Within a few minutes, Pardalisca talks of preparations for a prandium and Olympio goes to get provisions for a cana. Ofcourse it may be that Pardalisca means by prandium a meal that is to be prepared immediately and that when preparations are to be made for the wedding feast this latter meal is called cena because it will take some time to get it ready. Possibly the prandium was forg'

in the excitement attendant upon the marriage preparation. If so we have the interesting fact that in the Plautine day the prandium may be omitted. But it seems more likely that it was by a mere accident that the poet used prandium in the first place and that when afterwards he spoke of cena he was thinking only of a change in the character of the meal (for prandium is never used of a marriage feast) and of no change in time. Thus we would have cena and prandium used of two different meals occurring, however, at the same time. Even this is not certain and the poet may have used the word prandium, as I have suggested before, to refer to a meal earlier in the day than the cena. But if this is so we should have some suggestion of it in the play, since as I have shown before the two words do not in themselves mark any definite time: Prandium, for instance referring to an early morning meal, (as in Amphitruo), a noon meal (as in Mostellaria), and a meal "usque ad vesperum", (as in Mercator). For this reason, therefore, I am inclined to believe that Plautus had in mind no distinction in time in regard to the prandium and cena of Casina. This matter, however, is merely incidental and in this discussion we are concerned chiefly with instances of the use of the two terms in reference to the same meal. In Bacchides we have had a certain example of this.

Less certain instances are to be found in Captivi and Menaechmi and another certain example in Mercator. Captivi opens with a monologue by Ergasilus, the parasite, who characterizes his class and explains the state of affairs. Hegio appears and Ergasilus after weeping with Hegio over the misfortune which has befallen the latter's son, asks to be invited to a cena (175). Hegio urges that his meals do not amount to much and finally the parasite leaves to look for a better meal intend:

if he failed to find one, to return. In the next few scenes the plot of the two captives is worked out and the pseudo-Tyndarus departs for Elis. At 461 Ergasilus returns and recounts his experiences:

"Nam ego ut dudum hinc abii, accessi ad adulescentes in foro:

'Salvete', inquam. 'Quo imus' inquam 'ad prandium?' Atque illi tacent.

'Quis ait: hoc? aut quis profitetur?' inquam: quasi muti silent,

Neque me rident. 'Ubi cenamus una?' inquam: atque illi abnuont."

478-481

"Nunc barbarica lege certumst ius meum omne persequi:

Qui concilium iniere, quo nos victu et vita prohibeant,

Is diem dicam, irrogabo multam, ut mihi cenae decem

Meo arbitrato dent, quom cara annona sit. Sic egero.

Nunc ibo ad potum hinc. Est illic mi una spes cenatica,

Si ea decolabit, redibo huc ad senem ad cenam asperam."

492-497

Next follow the scenes in which Aristophontes reveals the deception of Philocrates and Tyndarus. At 776 Ergasilus appears again bringing news of the return of Philopolemus. Hegio comes out of his house pondering over his disgrace. He sees the parasite and after wondering at the latter's strange words and actions says in 831:

"Hic homo ad cenam recipit se ad me."

In the next scenes the cena is prepared. Now what does Ergasilus mean by prandium in 479? Does he not refer to the cena of the rest of

play and is not this meal the same as that suggested by cenamus in 481? It is true that the verb may be general.³⁾ Throughout the entire play we have no other occurrence of prandium. Ergasilus has left Hegio to look for a cena. Why should he now speak of a different meal? It is useless to discuss the time, which Plautus seems to have disregarded entirely in this play. Between 460 and 768 Philocrates goes to Elis finds Philopolemus and Stalagmus and returns: certainly far too much for

3) Forcellini and Harper's Lexicon quote as a general use of the word prandium Martial 4, 49, 3:

"Ille magis ludit qui scribit prandia saevi

Tereos, aut cenam, crude Thyesta, tuam."

If prandium is general here, certain cena is also. Compare with this passage Rudens 508-9:

"Scelestiorem cenam cenavi tuam

Quam quae Thyestae quondam antepositast et Tereo."

In this passage Charmides is thinking of the cena he had eaten the night before with Labrax. General uses of these terms, nouns and verbs, are of course very difficult to find. If vesperum in Most. 700 indicates a real meal, cenandum in the next line must be general.

a single afternoon. Moreover there are no clear indications of time.

In 124 of Menaechmi, Menaechmus proposes to get a scortum and have a cena somewhere to-day:

"Hodie ducam scortum atque aliquo ad cenam condicam foras."

(Note the alliteration but contrast 388. More will be said of alliteration later.) Peniculus fears that he will have to fast:

"Nam si foris cenat, profecto me, haud uxorem, ulciscitur." 126

A few lines later (170) the palla stolen from Menaechmus's wife smells of furtum, scortum, prandium. In 173-5 Menaechmus says to Peniculus:

"Nunc ad amicum deferetur (the palla) hanc meretricem Erotium.

Mihi, tibi atque illi iudebo iam adparari prandium Pe. Eu.

Me. Inde^{usque} ad diurnam stellam crastinam potabimus."
(MSS. poterimus.)

Is not the prandium referred to identical with the cena of 124? In the rest of the play prandium alone is used (except in 794 where cena is probably general): 185 (proelium prandium), 186 (proelio prandio), 208 (note actutum 213), 225, 274, 287, 367, 387, (prandeamus), 388, 421, 460: the prandium is finished in 464, cf. 469, 476, 492, 521: see also 599, 611, 628: 965 shows that it is not yet night. If there is meant to be a distinction between the two words what can it be? Certainly not in character since the intention of the revellers is to extend the feast to the rising of the next day's morning star. (175.) When Menaechmus says cena he may have in mind a later meal. (155 ^{indicates} ~~refers to~~ noon as the time of the action:

"Dies quidem iam ad umbilicum est dimidiatus mortuos.")

When the word prandium is used the reference may be to a meal begun earlier, the only distinction being in the time the meal is begun. In this case then the prandium really becomes a cena. This may be the real distinction between the terms. In Bacchides however when Chrysalus says: "coctumst prandium", he is referring to a meal which earlier in the day has been called a cena and which has been prepared as a cena.

Whatever doubts may be felt about the terminology in these last plays are certainly not to be entertained in Bacchides and in a similar case in Mercator. In this play there are no clear indications of time. In 255 Demipho says that he went to the harbor at daybreak and it seems as if he has just returned. This suggests morning as the time of the action and other incidents point in the same direction: In 225 ff. a dream of the previous night is related, in 369 Charinus refers to a restless night. In 562 ff. Lysimachus and Demipho are arranging for the feast at the former's house. In 578 ff. Demipho says:

"Quid si igitur unum faciam hoc? si censes, coquam⁴⁾
Aliquem arripiamus, prandium qui percoquat
Apud te hic usque ad vesperum."

⁴⁾ This line is read by most modern editors (including Goetz-Schoell) following the early commentators:

"Quid si igitur cenam faciam? Hoc si censes, coquam."

Although this reading would prove conclusively that cena and prandium may refer to the same meal, the reading of Leo given above follows the MSS. closely and must be retained.

Lysimachus agrees and the two old men go out to get provisions. At
692 Lysimachus returns and complains of Demipho's extravagance:

"Decem si ad cenam vocasset summos viros,
Nimium opsonavit."

This may mean "if he had invited ten men to a cena, instead of merely a few to a prandium." But in 741 the cooks whom Lysichamus has hired appear. The chief says to his assistants:

"Agite, ite actutum: nam mihi amatori seni
Coquendast cena."

(cf. cenare, 802.) This certainly seems conclusive. The meal which Demipho has called a prandium, the cook a few moments later calls a cena.

To explain this apparent inconsistency is difficult. Neither Plautus' natural carelessness nor careless translation from the Greek is sufficient to account for it. The explanation suggested while discussing Menaechmi, that a prandium may be called a cena if it lasts till night, though applicable to Menaechmi, Captivi and Mercator is faulty as we have seen if applied to Bacchides. This may however be the correct solution. At first sight it seems that Plautus used one or the ^{other} term merely for the sake of alliteration: See, for example, the passage quoted above from Mercator (578 ff.): cenam - censes - coquam, aliquem - arripiamus, prandium - percoquat. But, though doubtless Plautus was fond of alliteration yet it does not always influence him: for we have many instances in which he seems to have avoided it. For instance, cocutmsst prandium in Bacchides is a lost opportunity and here, as we have seen, cena would be expected. Nor have we any proof that one or the other was a general term. Cena seems to have been used more

extensively but prandium is used regardless of time. For this reason prandium might be thought of as a general term and cena as specific: cena seems to be always used of an afternoon meal. May it not be that this confusion existed among the Roman people of Plautus's time? From the statements of Paul.-Fest. quoted above, we might expect prandium to be used of a morning and noon meal, but how is it that the word is used of a meal continuing till night? Perhaps this idea joined with one suggested above may offer the correct explanation: a confusion existed during Plautus's time in the use of prandium sometimes as a morning, sometimes as a noon meal, and if this prandium was continued after the ordinary cena time it was also called cena. At anyrate there seems to be no doubt that Plautus sometimes used both prandium and cena to indicate the same, afternoon meal.

With this in mind we may be able to explain a passage in Rudens which has hitherto successfully resisted attempts at interpretation. Daemones in the presence of Sceparnio and Plesidippus, discovers in the distance the shipwrecked girls: Plesidippus has just referred to his disappointment at not meeting Labrax and the girls at the appointed time and place (123 ff.) and both Daemones and Sceparnio have jocularly suggested that he has come in search of a prandium (140-143): in line with this Sceparnio explains the shipwreck as follows (148 ff.):

"Dae Pro di immortales, quid illuc est, Sceparnio,
 Hominum secundum litus? Sc. Ut mea opinio est,
 Propter viam sunt vocati ad prandium.

Dae. Qui? Sc. Quia post cenam, credo, laverunt heri.

<Dae.> Confracta navis in maris illis. <Sc.> Itast."

The efforts to explain this passage have hitherto been concerned chiefly with propter viam. This phrase is explained by Macrobius (Sat. 2, 4, 4): "Sacrificium apud veteres fuit quod vocabatur 'propter viam': in eo mos erat ut si quid ex epulis **superfuisset** igne consumeretur; huic Catonis locus est: namque Albidium quendam, qui bona sua comedisset et novissime domum quae ei reliqua erat incendio perdidisset, 'propter viam fecisse' dicebat: quod comesse non poteruit, id combussisse." In this passage of Rudens the phrase propter viam seems to be used in the same sense: Albidius was said propter viam fecisse because all that he had not been able to squander, he had burnt up. In Rudens the reference is to the loss of the girls' possessions by shipwreck, "their ruin being analogous to the burning of the remnants" as Sonnenschein expresses it. This propter viam sacrificium is shown by Paul.-Fest. to have been a sacrifice offered just before starting on a journey: "Propter viam fit sacrificium, quod est proficiscendi gratia, Herculi aut Sano, qui scilicet idem est deus." (229. 12 M.) The appropriateness of the phrase in the context is evident.

But a difficulty still remains: as Sonnenschein says "Why post cenam?" Ussing's explanation is lame: 'instead of following the usual practice of bathing before dinner, these men have bathed after dinner in preparation for the morning's breakfast.' This difficulty is easily removed by applying the results of our study of Plautus' use of cena and prandium and by another simple expedient.

In the first place the reference to the destruction of the remnants, i.e. the loss of the girls' property, would be much clearer if we read elaverunt (for laverunt) in the sense of "cleaned out" as in

579, 1307 (?), Asin. 135. That the simple verb lavo may have this meaning is hardly proved by lautae (699) and lautum (701), in which verses the meaning "soaked" is sufficient, as in 301 and the emendation to elautae (699) unnecessary. The phrasing of other passages in this same play makes the change to elaverunt very plausible. So in 579 a reference to this same misadventure we find:

"Eho an te paenitet

In mari quod elavi, ni hic in terra iterum eluam?"

And in 1307, which relates the same incidents with a confracta navis that reminds us of our own verse 152, the corruption at the end of the line very probably conceals elavi:

"Hac proxuma nocte et alii

Confractast navis, perdidit quicquid erat miser ibi omne."

Compare also Asin. 135:

"Nam in mari repperi, hic elavi bonis."

Now bearing in mind that Plautus may and does use cena and prandium of the same meal and that cena would be tempting on account of the alliteration we get the following perfect sense for our passage: Sceparnio says, "In my opinion yonder people were invited to a prandium (just as Plesidippus has been), but this meal was a propter viam prandium." "What do you mean?" asks Daemones, "why" responds the slave, "after their meal yesterday they got cleaned out." The word prandium Daemones at first naturally understands as a reference to the forenoon meal of the present day: naturally, because they have just been talking of Plesidippus's prandium. But Sceparnio's explanation makes clear not only the exact force of propter viam, but also the fact that prandium in

his phrase, which he now calls cena (the ordinary evening meal) is a meal of the previous day (cf. 508 where cena is again used in reference to this meal.) This cena - prandium like those of Mercator, Menaechmi, Captivi and Bacchides lasted till nightfall or might have, if it had taken place: the ship may have sailed in the night (58, 370.) We think of this meal when reading Ampelisca's reply to Trach^elio's question: "Where is Labrax?":

"Periit potando opinor:

Neptunus magnis poculis hac nocte eum invitavit." 361-2

This meal was a cena - prandium celebrated by Labrax and his party just before starting on their journey, and their fulfillment of the requirements of such a propter viam feast was forced upon them: they got cleaned out of what they did not eat by the shipwreck.





NON-CIRCULATING BOOK

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C040002491

112531

UNIVERS

5m-9,'26